



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/806,651	05/29/2001	Hiroiyuki Uenaka	MTS-3251US	3316

7590

01/24/2006

Allan Ratner  
Ratner & Prestia  
PO Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482

EXAMINER

HOSSAIN, FARZANA E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/806,651	UENAKA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Farzana E. Hossain	2617	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7-10,12,13,15,16, 18 and 24-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7-10,12,13,15,16,18 and 24-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 November 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11-17-05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed 11/17/2005. Claims 1, 2, 7-10, 12, 13, 15-16, 18, 24-26 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 24 are amended. Claims 2, 25-26 are previously presented. Claims 7-9, 12, 13, 15 and 16 are original. Claims 3-6, 11, 14, 17, 19-23 are cancelled.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Priority***

3. Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

### ***Specification***

4. The previous action dated 8-19-05 stated that the disclosure of Figures 16-18 references the number 37, from Figure 3. This number is not defined in Figures 16-18. The applicant did not acknowledge or make the correction. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2, 7-10, 16 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nijima et al (US 5,926,230 and hereafter referred to "Nijima") in view of Perlin et al (US 5,341,466 and hereafter referred to as "Perlin") and Young (US 5,949,954).

Regarding Claim 1, Nijima discloses an electronic program guide (EPG) information display method (Figure 5) wherein all or some of EPG of a predetermined channel is displayed (Figure 5), characterized in that in accordance with a zoom command instructing a continuous amount of zoom magnification (Figure 5), EPG information of channels or time frames larger or smaller in number than channels displayed immediately before the zoom command is provided is displayed (Figure 5), detail information includes in the EPG in accordance with the magnification of the zoom command is selectively displayed (Figures 5 and 21). Nijima is silent on the zoom command zooms in or out the screen with respect to EPG information of the displayed situated in the center, selecting an area in which the EPG information of a program that has already been recorded is displayed; reproduction of the program corresponding to the selected area is started. Perlin discloses a computer system with a processor and

Art Unit: 2617

operating system that displays data on a display area of a display unit (Figure 1, 111) and alls the system to modify the image via zooming (Figure 1). Perlin discloses the zoom command zooms in or out the screen with respect to EPG information of the displayed situated in the center or zooming to first or second level of detail (Figures 2-5). Young discloses by selecting an area in which the EPG information of a program that has already been recorded is displayed (Figure 2). Young discloses that if the "What's On Tape" feature is selected a recorded program can be selected from this directory and reproduced or played (Figure 13). It is necessarily included that if a recorded program is displayed on the EPG (Figure 3) and selected that reproduction of the program corresponding to the selected area is started. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nijima to include that the zoom command zooms in or out the screen with respect to EPG information of the displayed situated in the center or zooming to first or second level of detail (Figures 2-5) as taught by Perlin in order to allow users to choose a menu of options from a presentation of information depending on size (Column 1, lines 6-12, 42-50) and to show complex information even though display screen area becomes inadequate (Column 1, lines 15-19) as disclosed by Perlin. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Nijima to select an area of the EPG with recorded programs displayed and reproducing the programs (Figure 13) as taught by Young in order to allow users a convenient way to access television program listings including recorded programs (Column 1, lines 15-27) as disclosed by Young.

Regarding Claim 2, Nijima, Perlin and Young disclose all the limitations of Claim

1. Nijima discloses that EPG information is displayed and zoom magnification (Figures 5 and 21). Nijima does not teach that the program has to be on the air in order to be displayed. Young discloses that the predetermined channel and time frame are in a scope where a decision is made with reference to a channel and a time of program to be on the air being set in display mean in order to display the EPG information (Figures 2 and 3).

Regarding Claim 7, Nijima, Perlin and Young disclose all the limitations of Claim

1. Nijima and Young disclose the EPG area of the screen. Perlin discloses that information is displayed on the screen and that an amount of information to be displayed is changed according to a display area thereof (Figures 2-5).

Regarding Claim 16, Nijima, Perlin and Young disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Nijima and Perlin are silent on condition information of recording. Young discloses a function to operate in conjunction with a recorder is provided (Figures 2 and 3), in an area in which EPG information of a program of which recording is associated with said recorder is displayed (Figures 2 and 3), recording condition information for said recorder is displayed so as to be superimposed on the EPG information (Figures 2 and 3).

Regarding Claim 24, Nijima, Perlin and Young disclose all the limitations of Claims 1, 2, 7-10 or 16. Nijima discloses a recording medium (Figure 11B, 37) being able to be read by a computer or computer system (Figure 11B, 29) that stores a

program to cause a computer to perform some of the functions of the EPG information display method.

7. Claims 1, 2, 7-10, 16 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harada et al (EP 0901094 A2 and hereafter referred to as "Harada") in view of Young.

Regarding Claim 1, Harada discloses an electronic program guide (EPG) information display method (Figures 8-10) wherein all or some of EPG of a predetermined channel and time frame is displayed (Figures 8-10), characterized in that in accordance with a zoom command instructing a continuous amount of zoom magnification or a first, second, third or fourth detail degree (Figure 5), EPG information of channels or time frames larger or smaller in number than channels or time frames displayed immediately before the zoom command is provided is displayed (Figure 7), wherein the zoom command zooms in or out the screen with in respect to the first program cell of the displayed EPG information (Figures 8-10). Harada discloses that the display image of the zoomed in or out EPG is produced by the display image producing unit (Figure 3, 19) and that the CPU performs all functions. It is necessarily included that the CPU can be programmed that the zoomed in and out EPG is with respect to the EPG information of the displayed information situated in the center. Harada discloses detail information includes in the EPG in accordance with the magnification of the zoom command is selectively displayed (Figures 2 and 3). Harada does not disclose selecting an area in which the EPG information of a program that has

already been recorded is displayed; reproduction of the program corresponding to the selected area is started. Young discloses by selecting an area in which the EPG information of a program that has already been recorded is displayed (Figure 2). Young discloses that if the "What's On Tape" feature is selected a recorded program can be selected from this directory and reproduced or played (Figure 13). It is necessarily included that if a recorded program is displayed on the EPG (Figure 3) and selected that reproduction of the program corresponding to the selected area is started. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Harada to select an area of the EPG with recorded programs displayed and reproducing the programs (Figure 13) as taught by Young in order to allow users a convenient way to access television program listings including recorded programs (Column 1, lines 15-27) as disclosed by Young.

Regarding Claim 2, Harada and Young discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Harada discloses that EPG information is displayed and zoom magnification (Figures 8-10). Harada does not teach that the program has to be on the air in order to be displayed. Young discloses that the predetermined channel and time frame are in a scope where a decision is made with reference to a channel and a time of program to be on the air being set in display mean in order to display the EPG information (Figures 2 and 3).

Regarding Claim 7, Harada and Young discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Harada discloses that for EPG information of each program displayed on the screen, an



amount of EPG information to be displayed is changed according to a display area (Figure 5).

Regarding Claim 8, Harada and Young discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Harada discloses that items of the EPG information displayed in each area in which the EPG information is to be displayed are decided based on a size of the area, the number of pixels when the area is displayed or the number of letters that can be shown in the area (Figures 13-15). Harada discloses including displaying an EPG based on the zoom magnification or detail degree and also that the EPG information can also be displayed based on blank spaces or the number of letters that can be shown (Figures 13-16).

Regarding Claim 9, Harada and Young discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Harada discloses that priorities are previously assigned to items representing contents of the EPG information and the items are displayed in the order of priority (Figure 4, Figure 16). Harada discloses displaying an EPG based on the zoom magnification or detail degree (Figures 13-16).

Regarding Claim 10, Harada and Young discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Harada discloses that the zoom command stepwisely changes a size from the channel and the time frame displayed (Figure 8) before the zoom command is provided to a new channel and a time frame displayed after the zoom command is provided (Figure 9).

Regarding Claim 16, Harada and Young discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Harada is silent on condition information of recording. Young discloses a function to operate in conjunction with a recorder is provided (Figures 2 and 3), in an area in which EPG information of a program of which recording is associated with said recorder is

displayed (Figures 2 and 3), recording condition information for said recorder is displayed so as to be superimposed on the EPG information (Figures 2 and 3).

Regarding Claim 24, Harada and Young discloses all the limitations of Claim 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, or 16. Harada discloses a recording medium (Figure 69, 273) being able to be read by a computer or computer system (Figure 69, 270) that stores a program to cause a computer to perform some of the functions of the EPG information display method.

8. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nijima in view of Perlin and Young as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Davis et al (US 5,559,548 and hereafter referred to as "Davis").

Regarding Claim 8, Nijima, Perlin and Young disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Nijima, Perlin and Young are silent on items of information displayed based on size of area. Davis discloses that items of EPG information displayed in each area in which the EPG information is to be displayed are decide based on a size of the area, the number of pixels when the area is displayed or the number of letters can be shown in the area (Figures 5b, 5c, 7b, 10A). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nijima in view of Perlin and Young to include that items of information displayed in each area in which the information is to be displayed are decide based on a size of the area, the number of pixels when the area is displayed or the number of letters can be shown in the area (Figures 5b, 5c, 7b, 10A) as taught by Davis in order to present an EPG that is more

Art Unit: 2617

versatile, readable and aesthetically pleasing (Column 1, lines 9-16) as disclosed by Davis.

Regarding Claim 9, Nijima, Perlin and Young disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Nijima, Perlin and Young are silent on displaying items based on priority. Davis discloses that priorities are previously assigned to items representing contents of the EPG information and the items are displayed in the order of priority including title, rating, and actors (Figures 5b, 5c, 7b, 10A). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nijima in view of Perlin and Young to include that priorities are previously assigned to items representing contents of the EPG information and the items are displayed in the order of priority (Figures 5b, 5c, 7b, 10A) as taught by Davis in order to present an EPG that is more versatile, readable and aesthetically pleasing (Column 1, lines 9-16) as disclosed by Davis.

9. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nijima in view of Perlin and Young as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Proehl et al (US 6,577,350 and hereafter referred to as "Proehl").

Regarding Claim 10, Nijima, Perlin and Young disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Perlin discloses zooming into the content (Figures 2-5) and that the content is zoomed into one step at a time (Figures 2-5). Nijima, Perlin, Young are silent on the zooming stepwisely changes size and time displayed based on EPG information.

Proehl discloses that the zoom command stepwisely changes a size from the channel

and the time frame displayed (Figures 10) before the zoom command is provided to a new channel and a time frame displayed after the zoom command is provided (Figures 9-13). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nijima in view of Perlin and Young to include that the zoom command stepwisely changes a size from the channel and the time frame displayed (Figures 10) before the zoom command is provided to a new channel and a time frame displayed after the zoom command is provided (Figures 9-13) as taught by Proehl in order to allow users a convenient way to access television program listings more easily (Column 1, lines 21-26) as disclosed by Proehl.

10. Claims 12, 13, 15, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nijima in view of Perlin and Young as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lemmons et al (US 5,880,768 and hereafter referred to as "Lemmons").

Regarding Claim 12, Nijima, Perlin and Young disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Nijima discloses a sorting mode via a genre or theme (Figures 5). Nijima, Perlin and Young are silent on a search mode and the search criterion displayed in a different color. Lemmons discloses that an EPG operation function mode is a search mode when an area in which the EPG information of a program is displayed is selected and specified and the areas of programs associated with the program are shown in different color or brightness (Figure 7 and Column 14, lines 52-64). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Nijima in view of Perlin and

Young to include a search mode with EPG information is displayed and areas of the program shown in a different color (Column 13, lines 53-65) as taught by Lemmons in order to provide a convenient EPG and allow the viewer or user to locate programs of interest (Column 1, lines 5-17).

Regarding Claim 13, Nijima, Perlin, Young, and Lemmons disclose all the limitations of Claim 12. Nijima discloses a sorting mode via a genre or theme (Figure 5). Nijima, Perlin and Young are silent on a search mode and the search criterion displayed in a different color. Lemmons discloses that under a condition where the EPG operation function mode is the search mode (Figure 3, 116), a cursor for selecting and specifying an area corresponding to a search result selectively moves among parts of the areas in which EPG information is displayed which area are shown in the different color or highlighted (Column 13, lines 53-65).

Regarding Claim 15, Nijima, Perlin and Young discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Nijima, Perlin and Young are silent on the display of search results. Lemmons displays a search mode where EPG information is displayed in a manner of search results, where only the programs fulfilling the search criterion are displayed (Figure 7). Lemmons displays the programs in a fashion where the channels are in alphabetical order (i.e. HBO, Max, REQ, SHO) (Figure 7). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Lemmons to display the results in a manner where they display the channel axis or so as to be close to one another in a direction of a channel axis in order to provide a different viewing of the search results. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Nijima in view

of Perlin and Young to include a search mode to display the search results in a close manner (Figure 7) as taught by Lemmons in order to provide a convenient EPG and allow the viewer or user to locate programs of interest (Column 1, lines 5-17).

Regarding Claim 24, Nijima, Perlin, Young and Lemmons discloses all the limitations of Claim 12 or 15. Nijima discloses a recording medium (Figure 11B, 37) being able to be read by a computer or computer system (Figure 11B, 29) that stores a program to cause a computer to perform some of the functions of the EPG information display method.

11. Claims 12, 13, 15, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harada in view of Young as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lemmons.

Regarding Claim 12, Harada and Young discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Young discloses a sorting mode via a genre or theme search (Figures 15-17). Harada and Young are silent on a search mode and the search criterion displayed in a different color. Lemmons discloses that an EPG operation function mode is a search mode when an area in which the EPG information of a program is displayed is selected and specified and the areas of programs associated with the program are shown in different color or brightness (Figure 7 and Column 14, lines 52-64). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Harada in view of Young to include a search mode with EPG information is displayed and areas of the program shown in a different color (Column 13, lines 53-65) as taught by Lemmons in order to provide a

convenient EPG and allow the viewer or user to locate programs of interest (Column 1, lines 5-17).

Regarding Claim 13, Harada, Young and Lemmons disclose all the limitations of Claim 12. Young discloses a sorting mode via a genre or theme search (Figures 15-17). Harada and Young are silent on a search mode and the search criterion displayed in a different color. Lemmons discloses that under a condition where the EPG operation function mode is the search mode (Figure 3, 116), a cursor for selecting and specifying a n area corresponding to a search result selectively moves among parts of the areas in which EPG information is displayed which area are shown in the different color or highlighted (Column 13, lines 53-65).

Regarding Claim 15, Harada and Young disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Harada and Young are silent on the display of search results. Lemmons displays a search mode where EPG information is displayed in a manner of search results, where only the programs fulfilling the search criterion are displayed (Figure 7). Lemmons displays the programs in a fashion where the channels are in alphabetical order (i.e. HBO, Max, REQ, SHO) (Figure 7). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Lemmons to display the results in a manner where they display the channel axis or so as to be close to one another in a direction of a channel axis in order to provide a different viewing of the search results. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Harada in view of Young to include a search mode to display the search results in a close manner (Figure 7) as taught by Lemmons

in order to provide a convenient EPG and allow the viewer or user to locate programs of interest (Column 1, lines 5-17).

Regarding Claim 24, Harada, Young and Lemmons disclose all the limitations of Claim 12 or 15. Harada discloses a recording medium (Figure 69, 273) being able to be read by a computer or computer system (Figure 69, 270) that stores a program to cause a computer to perform some of the functions of the EPG information display method.

12. Claims 12, 13, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nijima in view of Perlin and Young as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Legall et al (US 6,005,565 and hereafter referred to as "Legall").

Regarding Claim 12, Nijima, Perlin and Young disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Young discloses a sorting mode via a genre or theme search (Figures 15-17). Nijima, Perlin and Young are silent on a search mode and the search criterion displayed in a different color. Legall discloses that an EPG operation function mode is a search mode when an area in which the EPG information of a program is displayed is selected and specified and the areas of programs associated with the program are shown in different color or brightness (Column 4, lines 49-53, Column 5, lines 1-21). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Nijima in view of Perlin and Young to include a search mode with EPG information is displayed and areas of the program shown in a different color (Column 4, lines 49-53) as taught by Legall in order to provide a convenient EPG and allow the viewer or user to locate programs of interest (Column 1, lines 5-17) as disclosed by Legall.



Regarding Claim 13, Nijima, Perlin, Young and Legall disclose all the limitations of Claim 12. Young discloses a sorting mode via a genre or theme search (Figures 15-17). Nijima, Perlin and Young are silent on a search mode and the search criterion displayed in a different color. Legall discloses that under a condition where the EPG operation function mode is the search mode (Figures 2, 3A, 3B), a cursor for selecting and specifying an area corresponding to a search result selectively moves among parts of the areas in which EPG information is displayed which area are shown in the different color or highlighted (Column 4, lines 49-65).

Regarding Claim 24, Nijima, Perlin, Young and Legall disclose all the limitations of Claim 12. Nijima discloses a recording medium (Figure 11B, 37) being able to be read by a computer or computer system (Figure 11B, 29) that stores a program to cause a computer to perform some of the functions of the EPG information display method.

13. Claims 12, 13, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harada in view of Young as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Legall et al (US 6,005,565 and hereafter referred to as "Legall").

Regarding Claim 12, Harada and Young disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Young discloses a sorting mode via a genre or theme search (Figures 15-17). Harada and Young are silent on a search mode and the search criterion displayed in a different color. Legall discloses that an EPG operation function mode is a search mode when an area in which the EPG information of a program is displayed is selected and specified

Art Unit: 2617

and the areas of programs associated with the program are shown in different color or brightness (Column 4, lines 49-53, Column 5, lines 1-21). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Harada in view of Young to include a search mode with EPG information is displayed and areas of the program shown in a different color (Column 4, lines 49-53) as taught by Legall in order to provide a convenient EPG and allow the viewer or user to locate programs of interest (Column 1, lines 5-17) as disclosed by Legall.

Regarding Claim 13, Harada, Young and Legall disclose all the limitations of Claim 12. Young discloses a sorting mode via a genre or theme search (Figures 15-17). Harada and Young are silent on a search mode and the search criterion displayed in a different color. Legall discloses that under a condition where the EPG operation function mode is the search mode (Figures 2, 3A, 3B), a cursor for selecting and specifying an area corresponding to a search result selectively moves among parts of the areas in which EPG information is displayed which area are shown in the different color or highlighted (Column 4, lines 49-65).

Regarding Claim 24, Harada, Young and Legall disclose all the limitations of Claim 12. Harada discloses a recording medium (Figure 69, 273) being able to be read by a computer or computer system (Figure 69, 270) that stores a program to cause a computer to perform some of the functions of the EPG information display method.

14. Claims 18 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nijima in view of Perlin and Young as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Schein et al (US 6,133,909 and hereafter referred to as "Schein").

Regarding Claim 18, Nijima, Perlin and Young disclose all the limitations of Claim 16. Nijima and Perlin are silent on condition information of recording. Young discloses that the condition information for the recording is underway (Figures 2 and 3), that the recording is finished (Figure 2 and 3) and that the programming of timer recording is finished (Figures 2 and 3). Young discloses that the recorder can be a VCR or other recording device. Young does not disclose multiple recording devices or that condition information for the recorder is information representing a type of the recorder. Schein discloses that multiple recorders may exist whether digital or analog (Column 3, lines 36-43). Schein discloses that the user can choose which select the recording device (Column 5, lines 1-3). It is necessarily that condition information for the recorder is information representing a type of the recorder. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Nijima in view of Perlin and Young to include multiple recorders to select the type of recorder (Column 3, lines 36-43 and Column 5, lines 1-3) as taught by Schein in order to allow automatic unattended recording of one or more programs (Column 4, lines 63-67) as disclosed by Schein.

Regarding Claim 24, Nijima, Perlin, Young and Schein discloses all the limitations of Claim 18. Nijima discloses a recording medium (Figure 11B, 37) being able to be read by a computer or computer system (Figure 11B, 29) that stores a

program to cause a computer to perform some of the functions of the EPG information display method.

15. Claims 18 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harada in view of Young as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Schein.

Regarding Claim 18, Harada and Young discloses all the limitations of Claim 16. Harada is silent on condition information of recording. Young discloses that the condition information for the recording is underway (Figures 2 and 3), that the recording is finished (Figure 2 and 3) and that the programming of timer recording is finished (Figures 2 and 3). Young discloses that the recorder can be a VCR or other recording device. Young does not disclose multiple recording devices or that condition information for the recorder is information representing a type of the recorder. Schein discloses that multiple recorders may exist whether digital or analog (Column 3, lines 36-43). Schein discloses that the user can choose which select the recording device (Column 5, lines 1-3). It is necessarily that condition information for the recorder is information representing a type of the recorder. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Harada in view of Young to include multiple recorders to select the type of recorder (Column 3, lines 36-43 and Column 5, lines 1-3) as taught by Schein in order to allow automatic unattended recording of one or more programs (Column 4, lines 63-67) as disclosed by Schein.

Regarding Claim 24, Harada, Young and Schein disclose all the limitations of Claim 18. Harada discloses a recording medium (Figure 69, 273) being able to be read

by a computer or computer system (Figure 69, 270) that stores a program to cause a computer to perform some of the functions of the EPG information display method.

16. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nijima in view of Oosterhout et al (US 6,405,371 and hereafter referred to as "Oosterhout").

Regarding Claim 25, Nijima discloses displaying an EPG on a display comprising the steps of: storing a plurality of program information cells, each cell including video image data (Figures 5, 7, 20, 25, 26) with a predetermined number of cells for EPG display (Column 19, lines 58-66), simultaneously displaying on the EPG video image data stored for each cell (Figures 5, 7, 20, 25, 26). Nijima discloses zooming on the EPG (Figure 5). Nijima is silent on that selecting the first predetermined number of cells or reducing the video image data simultaneous displayed by selecting a third predetermined number of cells on the EPG, the third number being of greater magnitude and displaying the video image data for the cells. Oosterhout discloses selecting a first predetermined number of cells (Figure 4, Column 5, lines 9-14) for EPG display, selecting to reduce the EPG information by selecting a third predetermined number of cells to display (Figures 4, 8). Nijima discloses that the number of cells on display can be selected because the second predetermined number of cells being of lesser magnitude than the first (Figures 5 and 21).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Nijima for selecting a first predetermined number of cells (Figure 4, Column 5, lines 9-14) for

EPG display) as taught by Oosterhout in order to provide enhance the convenience of the EPG (Column 1, lines 31-34) as disclosed by Oosterhout.

Regarding Claim 26, Nijima and Oosterhout disclose all the limitations of Claim 25. Nijima discloses storing broadcasting channel number and broadcasting time for each of the plurality of cells (Column 11, lines 18-23). Oosterhout discloses selecting the first predetermined number of cells (Figures 4, 8), each having a similar broadcasting time and arranged in a tunable sequence of broadcasting channel numbers (Column 2, lines 37-45, Figure 7).

17. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harada in view of Nijima.

Regarding Claim 25, Harada discloses displaying an EPG on a display comprising the steps of: storing a plurality of program information cells, each cell including program information data including a representative picture (Figures 3-5, 13, 16). Harada discloses selecting a first predetermined number of cells (Figure 9) for EPG display (Figure 3-10, 13), magnifying the EPG information by selecting a second predetermined number cells to display (Figure 10), and/or selecting to reducing the EPG information by selecting a third predetermined number of cells to display (Figure 8). Harada discloses that the number of cells on display can be selected because the second predetermined number of cells being of lesser magnitude than the first (Figure 10) and that the third predetermined number of cells being of greater magnitude than the first (Figure 8). Harada does not disclose displaying EPG video image data or

simultaneously displaying on the EPG video image data stored in each cell in the selected predetermined number of cells, and magnifying the video image data by selecting the second predetermined number of cells on the EPG, and reducing the video image data simultaneously by selecting a third predetermined number of cells on the EPG, displaying the video image data stored in the cells. Niijima discloses displaying video image data of the program selected including program information (Figure 5) and that video image data is stored (Figure 4). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Harada by displaying video image data simultaneously with EPG data (Figure 5) as taught by Niijima in order to provide select programs from an EPG quickly (Column 1, lines 60-64) as disclosed by Niijima. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Harada by changing the priorities list (Figure 4, 16) or details of detail degrees (Figure 5) of the EPG by including video data (as taught by Niijima) whether in magnified or reduced form (Figures 8-10) in order to provide the viewer with a EPG display with the desired level of information (Page 2, Paragraph 0004) as disclosed by Harada.

Regarding Claim 26, Harada and Niijima disclose all the limitations of Claim 25. Harada discloses storing broadcasting channel number and broadcasting time for each of the plurality of cells (Figure 3) and selecting the first predetermined number of cells (Figure 9), each having a similar broadcasting time and arranged in a tunable sequence of broadcasting channel numbers (Figure 9).

Art Unit: 2617


**Conclusion**

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farzana E. Hossain whose telephone number is 571-272-5943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

FEH  
January 17, 2006

  
**CHRIS KELLEY**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**